

2002 San Bernardino County Annual Survey:

A joint endeavor of the
Inland Empire Research Consortium and
San Bernardino Associated Governments



Co-Principal Investigators:

Shel Bockman, Barbara Sirotnik, and Max Neiman

INTRODUCTION

The Inland Empire Research Consortium (IERC) is pleased to present the results of its **2002 San Bernardino County Annual Survey** of residents in San Bernardino County. In previous years IERC has produced the *Inland Empire* Annual Survey, a survey of Riverside and San Bernardino County residents. This year the survey is limited to San Bernardino County and does not address public perceptions outside of the county. This year's survey is a joint endeavor of IERC and SANBAG.

The purpose of the **San Bernardino County Annual Survey** is to provide policy-related research that bears on issues important to San Bernardino County. The San Bernardino County Annual Survey provides decision-makers with objective, accurate and current information for:

- ♦ **evaluating key public and private sector services and activities** (e.g., retail services, health care, education, transportation);
- ♦ **describing the public's current views as well as changes over time** in public perceptions of such issues as: quality of life, the state of the local economy, perceptions of the region as a place to live and work, the greatest problems and issues (e.g., crime, pollution, immigration) facing San Bernardino County, commuting, traffic congestion, and promotion of economic development;
- ♦ **providing a regional focus** for the on-going discussion of key local/regional issues; and
- ♦ **disseminating a coherent picture of San Bernardino County residents' views, beliefs, and demographic characteristics** to key decision makers within and outside the county, thus enabling comparisons to other counties.

The IERC represents a partnership between the Institute of Applied Research and Policy Analysis at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) and the Center for Social and Behavioral Sciences Research at University of California Riverside (UCR). Apart from the objectives listed above, the IERC is committed to promoting regionalism and cooperation, and to projecting the Inland Empire onto the radar screen of other "significant actors" in the State. It is

our hope that the Annual Survey will, in future years, again reflect the two-county area (rather than just San Bernardino County) and that it will continue to be a valuable area resource for initiating community discourse and helping to inform public policy, officials, and citizens by incorporating proprietary questions from public and private agencies in the two county area.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire items were selected on the following basis: Several questions were incorporated from previous annual surveys of Riverside and San Bernardino counties which were designed to track changes over time in the residents' perceptions about their quality of life and economic well-being, their views about the pressing issues of the day, and their ratings of public services and agencies. In addition, a number of standard demographic questions were included for tracking purposes and for cross tabulation of findings. Tracking questions, of course, provide public agencies and businesses with trend data often needed in policy making and outcome assessments. These questions are also valuable in comparing the county with other counties in the state and nation. Questions were also submitted by SANBAG. A Spanish version of the questionnaire was produced, the survey instrument was then pre-tested (both languages), and some minor changes to the wording and order of some items were made. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix I.

SAMPLING METHODS

As indicated earlier, this year's survey focused exclusively on residents within San Bernardino County. As part of this effort, SANBAG was also interested in region-specific differences within the county. Specifically, three regions of interest were defined: **East/West Valley** (all cities and unincorporated areas within the urbanized valley region of San Bernardino County); **Victor Valley** (mainly Victorville, Hesperia, Apple Valley and Adelanto); and **Desert** (communities outside the urbanized valley and Victor Valley areas). IERC chose to sample the regions with unequal sample sizes so as to reflect the fact that the East/West Valley zone comprises a greater proportion of the county's population than the other regions. On the other hand, sample sizes are not strictly proportional to the population, since such a breakdown would

not result in sufficient sample size to generalize to the two smaller regions (Victor Valley and Desert). The final regional sample sizes were: 253 in East/West Valley, 179 in the Victor Valley region, and 179 in the Desert Region. The accuracy of the zone data varies depending on the number of respondents sampled within each zone, however each of the zones has a 95% level of confidence and an accuracy better than plus or minus 7.3%. The total county-wide sample size of 611 (11% of which were conducted in Spanish and the remainder in English) has a 95% level of confidence and an accuracy of plus/minus 4%. Of course, **in order to remove the effects of the over-sampling, weighting factors were applied to the data when county-wide results were tabulated.**

Within each region, telephone survey respondents were randomly selected from a comprehensive sample frame consisting of all telephone working blocks which contain residential telephone numbers in the region. This is a standard random sampling approach for studies of this nature. Telephone interviews were conducted by the Institute of Applied Research at California State University, San Bernardino using computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) equipment and software. The surveys were conducted between November 7, 2002 and November 14, 2002.

INTRODUCTION TO FINDINGS

Following are the major findings from this year's San Bernardino County Annual Survey. Findings are generally presented for San Bernardino County as a whole. In those few instances where there exist significant differences between the three regions, such dissimilarities will be noted and discussed in detail.

In addition, this report includes six years of continuous data to conduct more extensive trend analysis than in previous reports. It must be noted that trend analysis is made more difficult since the former distinct regions East and West Valley have been combined into one region for this report. The trend analysis will be conducted assuming that this year's combined zone can essentially be seen as an average for the two previously separate zones.

Finally, as noted in the preceding section, the tables in the data display and in the following sections of the report reflect a weighting scheme to correct for over-sampling of certain

geographic areas in the county. Throughout this report, therefore, when we refer to the number of respondents indicating a particular view (a number that is a weighted figure), the actual number of respondents may differ from the adjusted figure reported in the table. For a full data display of countywide (weighted) findings, see Appendix II. Regional breakdowns are shown in Appendix III.

COMMUTING AND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

OVERVIEW: *Since the 1998 Annual Survey, commute times have remained relatively stable, with most respondents from all zones spending less than an hour commuting to and from work. Most work within San Bernardino County, although gradually more and more people traveling outside the county for employment. About a quarter of those surveyed are willing to take a pay cut to work closer to home. Many commuters do not use freeways for their trip to and from work, but of those who do, I-10 is used often by East/West Valley respondents and Desert respondents, whereas Victor Valley respondents use I-15.*

The length of reported commuting times (Question 28) has remained fairly constant over time (Table 1). The key observation, however, is that a substantial majority (61%) of San Bernardino County respondents had commuting times of less than one hour, and that during the previous years the proportion of commuters in the “less than 1 hour” category has remained fairly constant, varying within 2-3 percentage points.

Since the 1998 survey, the Desert Region has shown the highest proportion of respondents with relatively short commute times (less than one hour). This figure is significantly higher than the proportion for Victor Valley respondents.

Table 1. % With Total Commuting Times Of Less Than 1 Hour

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %	San Bernardino County
1997 Survey	69	48	60	56	58
1998 Survey	60	54	58	71	58
1999 Survey	67	56	58	72	62

2000 Survey	68	59	43	76	61
2001 Survey	67	56	56	72	60
2002 Survey	61		55	69	61

Although a large majority of respondents report commuting a total of less than one hour each day, a significant number of respondents commute for longer times. Indeed, many San Bernardino County respondents commute for over two hours (17 % of East/West Valley, 22% of Victor Valley, and 5% of Desert respondents – all within the margin of error from previous year’s results). Longer commuting time, of course, takes its toll in terms of personal lifestyle, individual costs for gas and maintenance, implications for energy consumption, and county and state costs for the required road improvements and maintenance.

The majority (67%) of those respondents who commute to work report that they travel to work within their own county (Question 30), with Los Angeles County being the number two destination (Table 2). This pattern has been noted in previous Annual Surveys and it continues this year, although there has been a seeming slight erosion in the percentage of people working within San Bernardino County and an accompanying increase in those traveling to Riverside, Los Angeles, and Orange counties. At first glance it may appear that these changes over time are within the margin of error and can be dismissed as simple sampling variation. On further inspection, however, it is possible that job creation is simply not fast enough in San Bernardino, and thus people are leaving the county in increasing numbers to find employment.

**Table 2: Distribution of
Commuting Destinations, 1998-2002**

Work Destination County	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
San Bernardino	72.5	73.3	70.1	69.3	67.0
Riverside	7.8	5.7	7.1	7.9	8.7
Orange	3.3	3.2	4.4	3.8	6.2
Los Angeles	13.5	14.8	15.3	16.1	16.1
San Diego	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.6
Other	2.6	2.5	2.5	1.9	1.4

Zone-specific analysis corroborates this picture of a slight erosion in employment within San Bernardino County. As in earlier years, the East and West Valley zones continue to register

the highest amount of inter-county commuting, with 36% of East/West Valley respondents traveling outside the county (predominantly to Los Angeles County), and approximately 16% of respondents in the other two zones leaving the county. These results are similar to those of the last two years.

Given the large percentage of respondents commuting outside the county to work, it was of interest to determine whether people would accept a pay cut to work locally and eliminate their daily commute. Specifically, two questions addressed this issue, the first asking about a 10% decrease in salary and the second asking about a 5% decrease (Questions 31 and 32). Nearly a quarter of respondents (23%) indicated that they would be willing to accept a 10% decrease in salary in order to work closer to home. Even more (27%) would be willing to accept a more moderate decrease of 5%. These figures are dramatically higher than those obtained in the 1998 Annual Survey which posed a similar question. In that survey only 15% expressed any willingness *at all* to accept a pay cut to work closer to home. This could be a function of increasing congestion on the roads, increasing weariness with long-distance commuting, or a combination of both. In either event, these findings suggest that over time the number of commuters willing to accept a pay cut will most likely continue to increase, and thus the need for job creation in San Bernardino County is reinforced.

There are, as expected, zone-specific differences, with Victor Valley and East/West Valley respondents responding differently from Desert respondents. Specifically, Desert respondents indicate less of a willingness to accept *any* pay cut to work closer to home, however this can be simply explained by noting that relatively few Desert respondents deal with long commutes and out-of-county commutes.

Question 33 on the survey asks the respondent to indicate which freeways are used during the commute to work (with multiple responses accepted). The following table (Table 3) shows the data broken down by zones as well as combined for the county as a whole. Clearly the results are a function of geographic proximity to the freeways and size of commuting population.

Table 3. Number and Percentage of Commuters Using Various Freeways

FREEWAY	East/West Valley (n = 134)	Victor Valley (n = 70)	Desert (n = 68)	San Bernardino County (n = 308*)
I-10	40 (30%)	9 (13%)	12 (18%)	85 (28%)

60	28 (21%)	7 (10%)	1 (1%)	59 (19%)
I-15	17 (13%)	39 (56%)	8 (12%)	53 (17%)
210/30	14 (10%)	8 (11%)	0 (0%)	31 (10%)
215	12 (9%)	7 (10%)	2 (3%)	27 (9%)
91	8 (6%)	3 (4%)	0 (0%)	17 (6%)
Don't drive freeway	48 (36%)	26 (37%)	34 (50%)	112 (36%)

* Numbers do not add up due to weighting scheme applied

Finally, two questions were asked only of Victor Valley area respondents regarding their awareness and usage of commuter bus service which exists to take people “down the hill” from the Victor Valley (Questions 34 and 35). Fewer than half of the Victor Valley respondents (48%) reported an awareness of the service, and none of those respondents had used it. These findings, however, should be understood in the context that the service only began in July (five months prior to this year’s survey), thus it is likely that the 48% awareness figure will likely increase over time.

MEASURE I QUESTIONS

OVERVIEW: Very few zone respondents report being aware of the Measure I tax. Of those who are aware of Measure I, most report their impression that it has improved transportation in the county. Highest priority transportation improvements are those which directly impact the respondents’ driving: freeway expansion, local street repairs and widening, and freeway improvements related to truck safety.

Another series of questions on the survey addressed the Measure I sales tax: awareness of the tax in general, awareness of specific projects, evaluation of effectiveness in improving transportation in San Bernardino County, and priorities for usage of the money (Questions 36 - 39). Overall awareness of the tax was low: only about 11% of respondents indicated that they had heard of it (a figure relatively consistent for all regions). That figure is significantly lower than the 24% who indicated an awareness of Measure I in the 2000 Annual Survey. Of course, this may partially reflect the different ways the question was worded on the two surveys. This year respondents were simply asked “Have you heard of the Measure I sales tax,” whereas two years ago the question was more specific and detailed: “In 1989 San Bernardino County residents approved Measure I, a ½ cent sales tax to pay for transportation improvements. Are you aware of Measure I?”

The 66 people (11% of respondents) who indicated an awareness of the measure were then asked further questions. When asked to *name* a Measure I project (without reading a list to the respondents), most respondents (64%) were unable to name any Measure I projects at all. The few people who were able to name projects mentioned: Interstate 10 carpool lanes in Ontario and Montclair (11 people), Metrolink train (7 people), SR 210/30 in Rancho Cucamonga and Fontana, Bear Valley Road in Victorville/Apple Valley/Hesperia (2 people), or local bus service (only 1 person). No one mentioned SR 71 in Chino/Chino Hills. Clearly, public officials need to do an extensive marketing campaign for Measure I, one which links the measure with specific and concrete projects, when the renewal finally comes to the ballot. Based on previous survey data, support for continuation of Measure I is high (68% in the 2001 Annual Survey) when questions about the support follow an extensive listing of Measure I projects.

All respondents were asked their opinion as to whether the Measure I tax has improved transportation overall in San Bernardino County. Given the results reported above, it is not surprising that 40% of respondents indicated that they simply “don’t know.” Of those expressing an opinion, however, 68% indicated that they “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” that Measure I has, indeed, improved transportation overall in the county. These findings hold for the sample as a whole, *as well as* for registered voters (65% support), and also among *likely* voters (registered voters who indicate that they vote in all elections) for whom the support is at the 67% level.

Finally, respondents were asked to prioritize various transportation issues that could be addressed by the Measure I ½ cent transportation tax. The results are reported in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Priority of Transportation Issue That Could Be Addressed By Measure I

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Don't Know
Metrolink train expansion	41%	36%	16%	7%
Public bus service expansion	35%	36%	20%	9%
Local street repairs and widening	62%	26%	10%	2%
Freeway expansion	66%	21%	11%	2%
Freeway improvements related to truck safety	61%	27%	10%	2%

The results show that the automobile culture is alive and well in San Bernardino County in that respondents prefer that their tax money be spent on transportation improvements that will allow them to continue driving their own automobiles (as opposed to taking advantage of public transportation). On the other hand, the priority rankings above do not force the respondent to make a choice between competing transportation improvement strategies. In the abstract, therefore, respondents are likely to consider *all* transportation improvement strategies worthwhile unless they are forced to make a choice among competing solutions to the problem of traffic congestion.

Some zone-specific differences were noted regarding transportation priorities. Table 5 shows the percentage of respondents in each zone who consider each transportation improvement to be a high priority expenditure. Desert respondents are not as concerned with using funds for freeway expansion or Metrolink train expansion as are respondents in the other zones.

Table 5. Percentage of Respondents Indicating the Transportation Improvement is a HIGH Priority

	East/West Valley (n = 252)	Victor Valley (n = 178)	Desert (n = 178)
Metrolink train expansion	41%	44%	23%
Public bus service expansion	33%	39%	44%
Local street repairs and widening	59%	77%	62%
Freeway expansion	69%	60%	42%
Freeway improvements related to truck safety	62%	57%	55%

RATINGS OF THE COUNTY

OVERVIEW: *As in previous surveys, a substantial majority of San Bernardino County residents in each zone continue to rate their county as a good place to live. Traditional sources of satisfaction with living in Southern California continue to be mentioned as the “best” things about living in the county. Crime and smog continue to be mentioned as the predominant negatives.*

As has been the case since the inception of the Annual Survey in 1997, the majority of residents rate San Bernardino County as a "fairly good" or "very good" place to live (Question 3).

Table 6. Ratings of San Bernardino County as a Place to Live

RATING	East/West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Very good	23%	20%	16%	23%
Fairly good	50%	55%	52%	51%
Neither good nor bad	16%	17%	22%	17%
Fairly bad	4%	4%	6%	4%
Very bad	6%	4%	3%	5%

Further, as Table 7 shows, it is encouraging that the ratings are generally maintaining a trend of improvement over time in all zones.

Table 7. Trend -- Proportion of Respondents Indicating Their County Is A "Very Good" or "Fairly Good" Place to Live

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %
1997 Survey	50	76	67	63
1998 Survey	58	76	66	69
1999 Survey	59	78	71	64
2000 Survey	55	77	73	63
2001 Survey	65	77	77	69
2002 Survey	73		75	68

To help place the above findings in perspective, respondents were asked to indicate the one BEST and one MOST NEGATIVE thing about living in the county (Questions 4 and 5). One of the more interesting findings has to do with how San Bernardino zone residents view affordable housing in the region. Until two years ago, this wasn't even on residents' "radar screen" of best things about the county. This year it has risen to the second most often mentioned positive factor by respondents in the East/West Valley zone (Table 8), and is offered as an important factor by respondents in the other zones. Of course, the standard factors of "good area, location, scenery," "not crowded," and "good climate, weather" are cited as a "plus" of living in the county.

Table 8. Positive Factors Mentioned About the County

	East/West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Good area, location, scenery	43%	32%	28%	41%

Affordable housing	13%	13%	6%	13%
Not crowded	8%	15%	13%	10%
Good climate, weather	7%	19%	18%	9%

In last year's survey, smog/air pollution was the most often mentioned negative factor, followed closely by crime and gang activity. This year the order of these factors has switched, returning to the trend from the 2000 Annual Survey. This, surprisingly, was the case even in the Desert zone, an area not known for its crime. Further, last year traffic was mentioned as a factor, but only about a third as often as smog. This year those factors were mentioned almost an equal number of times.

Table 9.
Negative Factors Mentioned About the County

	East/West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Crime, gang activity	20%	14%	9%	19%
Smog, air pollution	16%	7%	7%	14%
Traffic	12%	12%	2%	11%
Lack of job opportunity/economy	6%	10%	7%	7%

When the category of "drugs" is added to "crime and gang activity" the results are even more striking. Crime continues to be a problem which policy makers must address. On the other hand, it is encouraging that the percentages mentioning crime as a negative factor have not significantly changed since last year's survey.

In the 1999 report, we had noted that smog/air pollution had dramatically disappeared as a highly salient negative thing about county life in the minds of respondents. In 2000 it returned as a pressing concern in two of the four zones (East and West Valley). Last year and this year it appears to be a concern in *all* zones, and the figures for all zones are relatively unchanged from the 2001 survey.

Table 10.
% Mentioning Smog as a Negative Factor

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert
1997 Survey	14%	19%	5%	2%
1998 Survey	11%	15%	7%	3%

1999 Survey	0%	2%	0%	0%
2000 Survey	16%	15%	3%	1%
2001 Survey	17%	17%	8%	6%
2002 Survey	16%		7%	7%

What do respondents perceive to be the major contributors to air pollution in the Inland Empire (Question 40)? Auto exhaust is considered to be the primary source (mentioned by 62% of respondents), followed by truck emissions (34%) and factories (24%). But surprisingly, only 13% indicated that the air pollution comes from other geographic areas, yet this statement is heard quite often throughout the county. These results are consistent across all zones.

FEAR OF CRIME AND CRIME RELATED ISSUES

OVERVIEW: *The dramatic drop in last year's fear of being the victim of a serious crime has been reinforced this year. Other than the figures from the 2000 Annual Survey (which may have been an anomaly), the fear of crime has declined steadily since 1997.*

As noted above, the perennial problem of drugs, crime and gang activity still remains salient as a negative factor in San Bernardino County. Yet the "big news" reported last year regarding a significant decrease in crime from the previous year appears to be holding. When the question was asked directly: "how fearful are you that you will be a victim of a serious crime, such as a violent or costly crime" (Question 10), a little over a third of county residents express that they are either "very fearful" or "somewhat fearful." As noted in Table 11, this figure has not significantly changed since last year's survey.

In most past surveys, East and West Valley respondents expressed a higher level of fear of being the victim of a serious crime (such as a violent or costly crime) than respondents in the Victor Valley and the Desert regions. This year, results for Victor Valley are virtually identical to the combined East and West Valley zones. Desert respondents continue to express much less concern with being the victim of a serious crime than those of the other zones.

Table 11.
% "Very Fearful" or "Somewhat Fearful" of being the victim of a serious crime

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
--	-------------	-------------	---------------	--------	-----------

1997 Survey	46%	41%	40%	36%	43%
1998 Survey	48%	38%	33%	20%	40%
1999 Survey	38%	36%	37%	23%	36%
2000 Survey	48%	39%	33%	24%	41%
2001 Survey	35%	32%	25%	21%	32%
2002 Survey	35%		34%	26%	35%

ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

***OVERVIEW:** Countywide, perceptions of personal economic well-being have significantly declined, although perceptions of the county's economic state have remained relatively constant. Victor Valley, which in 2001 had seemingly withstood the declines in perceptions of economic well-being experienced in the rest of the county, has now registered its own downturn. About half of the respondents in all zones expect to be better off by next year.*

As noted in last year's report, respondents' rating of the county's economy was declining (most notably in the Desert zone and slightly in East and West Valley zones). At that time this decline was explained on the basis of a downturn in the national economy and as reflecting 9/11 impact. This year's findings (Question 9) suggest somewhat of a rebound in the East/West Valley region. But in the Desert region there has been no change from 2001, and in Victor Valley there has been a dramatic *decrease* in positive feelings about the economy. These findings are supported by both national, state, and regional economic reports which point to a softening of the economy.

County-wide, perceptions of the economy improved somewhat from last year. But the reader should note that the survey was taken in November before it was generally well-known that the State is in a budgetary crisis. It will be interesting to see next year's survey responses on this item.

Table 12.
% Rating the County's Economy as "Excellent" or "Good"

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	20%	46%	14%	24%	28%
1998 Survey	39%	56%	33%	39%	45%
1999 Survey	35%	62%	39%	39%	47%

2000 Survey	39%	51%	37%	37%	44%
2001 Survey	32%	46%	41%	27%	39%
2002 Survey	46%		27%	26%	43%

There are several other indicators of county economic well being in this study which cloud the picture slightly. Respondents offered perceptions about their own *personal* economic well being, and these were not necessarily consistent with their ratings of the county economy. Responding to the question “In comparison to a year ago, would you say that you and your family are better off, worse off, or the same” (Question 6) the percentage of respondents reporting being "better off" when compared with a year before has dropped precipitously in 2002 after remaining stable for the previous three years. The decline is especially marked in the East/West Valley zone and the Victor Valley zone.

Table 13.
% Indicating Their Finances Are "Better Off" Compared With a Year Ago

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	39%	38%	28%	22%	34%
1998 Survey	44%	52%	38%	35%	46%
1999 Survey	38%	48%	35%	38%	42%
2000 Survey	38%	44%	42%	40%	41%
2001 Survey	35%	42%	36%	36%	38%
2002 Survey	30%		24%	32%	30%

Further, only about half of respondents in each zone remain optimistic about their own finances, and expect to be “better off” in terms of their family finances a year from now (Question 8). These findings are consistent with those in previous years which indicate that people tend to be optimistic about the future regarding their finances, even if they are less than pleased with their current economic state.

Another indicator of personal economic well being is the question: “Thinking about your household income, would you say that it is *enough so that you can save money* or buy some extras, *just enough to meet your bills and obligations*, or *is it not enough* to meet your bills and obligations” (Question 7). Many respondents still report having enough money to save and buy extras (Table 14). Yet, the majority of people within all zones indicated that money was tight

and that they had “just enough to pay their bills.” In addition, significantly fewer respondents in the Victor Valley and Desert zones indicate that there is enough money to save and buy extras. These findings reinforce from the previous survey which pointed out that there was a continuing and widening polarization occurring between the “haves” (those who indicate that they have enough money to save and buy extras) and “have nots” (those who report being somewhat strapped for funds).

Table 14.
% Indicating Their Household Income Is Sufficient To Save And Buy Extras

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %	SB County
1997 Survey	35%	44%	27%	27%	36%
1998 Survey	40%	46%	45%	40%	43%
1999 Survey	42%	41%	31%	39%	40%
2000 Survey	41%	42%	36%	35%	40%
2001 Survey	42%	45%	48%	43%	43%
2002 Survey	42%		36%	30%	41%

In summary, then, the economic and social-psychological aftermath of 9/11 continues to be felt within parts of the county, perhaps due to such factors as the fear of war in Iraq, fear of future terrorist acts, and further news of corporate scandals.

EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

OVERVIEW: *Ratings of private and public services have not changed significantly over time in the county overall, with high marks continuing to be given to Police/Sheriff services, shopping, and parks/recreation services. On the other hand, street/road maintenance, transportation, and entertainment continue to be problem areas.*

Each year the Annual Survey includes questions regarding respondents’ evaluations of local services from both the private and public sectors. Over time, there has been remarkable

stability in rankings. The following table details the percentage of respondents who indicate that the services are “excellent” or “good” (Questions 15 to 21).

Table 15.
% Rating Local Services as “Excellent” or “Good”

	East/West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Police/Sheriff	74%	57%	62%	71%
Shopping	74%	60%	32%	70%
Parks/Recreation	62%	40%	52%	58%
Public Schools	53%	43%	37%	51%
Entertainment	53%	34%	23%	49%
Transportation	42%	29%	40%	40%
Street/Road Maintenance	43%	21%	25%	39%

In previous years, police/sheriff services received the highest rankings countywide (Table 15), and these findings are essentially replicated this year. The highest level of “support” for police/sheriff services was in the East/West Valley region. Shopping also received extremely high ratings countywide with the notable exception being the Desert region in which only about a third of respondents ranked shopping as “excellent” or “good.” At the bottom of the list is the way streets and roads are kept up, with only four out of every 10 respondents giving the service a good or excellent rating. The problems with street and road maintenance appear to be especially severe (from the respondents perception) in the Victor Valley and Desert regions.

Since the inception of the survey there has been a high degree of stability in ratings of local services (Table 16). One special note: in past reports we have often commented on the fact that the ratings of public schools had declined. In this report, ratings have returned to 1998 higher levels.

Table 16.
Trends in “Excellent” or “Good” Ratings of Services

SERVICE	1997 Annual Survey	1998 Annual Survey	1999 Annual Survey	2000 Annual Survey	2001 Annual Survey	2002 Annual Survey
Police/Sheriff	66%	65%	70%	64%	66%	71%
Shopping	N/A	65%	68%	63%	68%	70%
Parks/Recreation	56%	56%	60%	58%	58%	58%
Public Schools	47%	51%	46%	41%	45%	51%
Entertainment	N/A	50%	49%	43%	46%	49%

Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A	36%	42%	40%
Streets/Roads	26%	35%	38%	33%	34%	39%

CONFIDENCE IN ELECTED OFFICIALS

OVERVIEW: *Although the majority of zone residents have at least some level of confidence that their elected city officials will adopt policies that will benefit the general community, there remains about a third of the respondents with either “not much” or “no” confidence in their elected officials.*

Respondents were asked: “How much confidence do you have that the elected officials in your city will adopt policies that will benefit the general community” (Question 22). A majority of respondents in all zones indicated that they have “some” confidence (57%) or a “great deal” of confidence (9%) that their elected city officials will adopt policies that will benefit the community. Further, the erosion in confidence noted in last year’s report has disappeared (Table 17).

Table 17.
% Reporting a "Great Deal" or "Some" Confidence
in Their Elected Officials

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	58%	78%	51%	56%	63%
1998 Survey	55%	69%	57%	54%	61%
1999 Survey	56%	66%	52%	49%	59%
2000 Survey	60%	71%	58%	52%	64%
2001 Survey	53%	65%	54%	55%	59%
2002 Survey	69%		51%	52%	66%

On the other hand, a significant proportion of people (about a third) within each of the zones expressed either “not much” or “no” confidence in their elected officials. The reader should also note that one’s view of the category “some” confidence (i.e. whether that is a positive or a negative statement) will have a significant impact in how one evaluates the citizens opinions regarding their elected officials.

FINAL NOTE

In this report we have presented countywide and zone-specific findings from the 2002 San Bernardino County Annual Survey. The reader is encouraged to review the full data displays (attached) for the complete listing of survey results. This report will be added to previous Annual Surveys on our web site (<http://iar.csusb.edu>) for those who wish to engage in more detailed comparative analysis with previous years' reports.

Once again, we wish to thank San Bernardino Associated Governments for their commitment to this project.

For questions about the San Bernardino County Annual Survey (or additional analysis tailored to a particular organization or agency), please contact the authors: Shel Bockman (909-880-5733), Barbara Sirotnik (909-880-5729), and Max Neiman (909-787-4693).

APPENDIX I

Questionnaire

APPENDIX II

Data Display